

**C/CAG**  
CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

## **AGENDA**

The next meeting of the  
**BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)**  
will be as follows.

**Date:** Thursday, December 1, 2005  
7:30 p.m. to 9:20 p.m.  
**Place:** San Mateo City Hall  
330 West 20th Avenue  
San Mateo, California  
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL SANDY WONG (599-1409) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- |    |   |  |             |                        |
|----|---|--|-------------|------------------------|
| 1. | Call To Order.  | Action<br>(Alfano)   |             | 7:30 p.m.<br>(5 mins)  |
| 2. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.  | Presentations are<br>limited to 3<br>minutes per<br>speaker. |             | 7:35 p.m.<br>(5 mins)  |
| 3. | Minutes of October 27, 2005 Meeting.  | Action<br>(Wong)   | Pages 1-3   | 7:40 p.m.<br>(5 mins)  |
| 4. | Bike Trip Planning Website and Integrated<br>Countywide Street Centerlines and Bike Route<br>Geographic Information System. | Action<br>(Brooks/Lodge)                                     | Pages 5-6   | 7:45 p.m.<br>(30 mins) |
| 5. | Countywide Bike Plan Project #4: North-South<br>Bikeway (Southern Section).   | Action<br>(Kline/Jones)                                      | Pages 7-12  | 8:15 p.m.<br>(20 mins) |
| 6. | BPAC Public Membership Policy.  | Information<br>(Napier)                                      | Pages 13-15 | 8:35 p.m.<br>(20 mins) |
| 7. | Countywide Pedestrian Plan Update.  | Action<br>(Kline)  | Pages 17-35 | 8:55 p.m.<br>(10 mins) |

8.	Update on Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program (RBPP)	Information (Kline)	Oral Report	9:05 p.m. (5 mins)
9.	San Mateo County Public Works Department Bike/Pedestrian Committee Establishment.	Information (Kline)	Oral Report	9:10 p.m. (5 mins)
10.	Member Communications.	Information (Alfano)		9:15 p.m. (5 mins)
11.	Adjournment.	Action (Alfano)		9:20 p.m.

**NOTE:** All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

Other enclosures/Correspondence

- None.

If you have any questions regarding the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, please contact Richard Napier at 650-599-1420 or Sandy Wong at 650-599-1409.

# **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)**

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **October 27, 2005**

---

#### **1. Call to Order.**

Chair Alfano called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. A quorum was achieved.

#### **Members Attending:**

David Alfano, Cathy Baylock, Maureen Brooks, Robert Cronin, Karyl Matsumoto, Matt Grocott, Mike Harding, Julie Lancelle, Mark Meadows, and Cory Roay.

#### **Staff/Guests Attending:**

Geoff Kline and Sandy Wong - C/CAG Staff. Guests were Stan Workman-Foster City, Andrew Wong-San Mateo, Robert Ovadia-Daly City, Ray Davis-Belmont, Pat Giorni-Burlingame resident, Gladwyn d' Souye-Belmont resident.

#### **2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.**

Ms. Pat Giorni commented on the following issues:

1. Caltrans does not have a plan to put bike route on Devil's Slide.
2. Bay Meadows project in San Mateo should relocate bike path to keep continuous north-south bike route.
3. In Millbrae: there are four crosswalks on El Camino Real with no signals. Suggest someone to get Caltrans to do something.
4. In San Bruno, the traffic signal for crossing on El Camino Real need to have three more seconds of walk time for pedestrian to cross.

While the BPAC appreciated Ms. Giorni's comments, Chair Alfano suggested Ms. Giorni to take the issues to the respective local jurisdictions for their consideration, and to contact Caltrans regarding El Camino Real since it is a State route.

#### **3. Minutes of July 28, 2005 meeting.**

*Motion: Chair Alfano moved/Lancelle seconded approval of the July 28, 2005 minutes. Motion carried.*

#### **4. Countywide Bicycle Plan Project # 10: US 101/Willow Road Interchange Project.**

Shahla Yazdy of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) made a presentation on this project. The Project Study Report (PSR) phase of this project is completed, that is the project initiation and concept design stage. There are six proposed alternative configurations for the interchange reconstruction. In terms of bike lane, it is pretty much the same in all of the alternatives. That is, the bike lane will end on both sides of the interchange, and then share a lane with traffic that is 15 feet wide. The next phase of the project will be the environmental study phase. It is

anticipated to begin in a few months. At that time, it will be opened for public review and comment.

Member Harding suggested that the I-280/Sand Hill interchange is a good model which carries bike in the middle.

BPAC decision: Support the project in principle, but the project as-is is not acceptable for the Countywide Bike Plan and need more highlights and details.

#### **5. San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Bikeway Strategic Plan.**

Shahla Yazdy of SMCTA stated that the TA is in the process of developing a Strategic Plan for the new Measure A Program (half cent sales tax for transportation). It will include criteria to prioritize funding for projects in the various programs within Measure A. The draft Strategic Plan will seek comments from the BPAC and other interested groups. The new Measure A will dedicate three percent (3%) of the revenue for bicycle/pedestrian improvements. SMCTA is also seeking a \$250K grant for a Caltrain Station Area Master Plan for bike and ped access.

#### **6. Countywide Bicycle Plan Project # 3: Ralston Avenue Bikeway.**

Ray Davis, Director of Public Works of Belmont, made a presentation on this project.

Phase 1: Completed: at-grade bike route up to west of Hiller Ave.

Phase 2: Design is 100% completed. It has received \$2.9 million Federal Earmarks funds.

BPAC believes this project provides good connectivity to sports centers as well as other trails. It also separates bike from motor traffic.

*Motion: Member Brooks moved/Baylock seconded to incorporate this project into Countywide Bike Plan.*

#### **7. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) \$2.5 million Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Federal funding cycle.**

Geoff Kline presented a recommendation on the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) funding cycle. Geoff suggested staff to provide preliminary application scoring for BPAC. BPAC will make the final recommendation to C/CAG in project priorities and funding. A mandatory workshop will be conducted.

BPAC suggested to change the ranking and description on page 21 of the packet under High: replace OR with AND.

*Motion: Member Baylock moved/Grocott seconded to accept staff recommendation on the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, allow staff to provide preliminary application scoring, BPAC will still have field trips.*

#### **8. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Pedestrian Project Description.**

BPAC concluded that the MTC Pedestrian Project Description as presented does not serve our need

for defining types of pedestrian projects. BPAC then directed staff to continue on developing pedestrian project types to be presented at a future meeting.

**9. San Mateo County Public Works Department Bike/Ped Committee Establishment.**

---

Geoff Kline reported that the County Public Works Department has approached the County Parks and Recreation Department to act as the County's Bike/Pedestrian Committee. Because this has not been finalized, this item will be continued.

**10. San Francisco Bicycle Signage Project.**

This item was deleted. Members may visit San Francisco on their own to see signs.

**11. Member Communications.**

Member Brooks has completed the bike map GIS set up. Richard Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, thanked Member Brooks for her hard work and great contribution to the bike map update.

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting ended at 9:28 p.m.



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

---

**Date:** December 1, 2005  
**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)  
**From:** Walter Martone  
**Subject:** Bike Trip Planning Website and Integrated Countywide Street Centerlines and Bike Route Geographic Information System  
  
(For further information or questions contact Walter Martone at 599-1465 or Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) accept the proposal for bike trip planning website and integrated countywide street centerlines and bike route geographic information system (GIS) and direct staff to explore funding sources for this project.

## FISCAL IMPACT

It is anticipated that the project will cost \$65,000.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

To be determined.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

BPAC is in the process of updating the Bicycle Transportation Map for San Mateo County and has developed a Countywide bike route Geographic Information System (GIS) layer in support of the map development. It would be beneficial to the public if this GIS enabled bike route information to be easily accessible by the public. In order to further this, the bike route data set must be maintained and kept up-to-date. This project proposes to incorporate the bike route data into an updated countywide data model which will take advantage of GIS methods to relate the bike routes to County street centerlines and to develop workflows and applications to support the on-going maintenance of the bike route data.

## ATTACHMENTS

Project Description from Adam Lodge, San Mateo County Public Works GIS Manager.

C:\Documents and Settings\pwuser\Desktop\Bike route info web base.DOC



Adam Lodge  
Public Works GIS Manager

## **Project Description: Bike Trip Planning Website and Integrated Countywide Street Centerline and Bike Path Geographic Information System**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (C/CAG) is currently revising the Bicycle Transportation Map for San Mateo County and has developed a county-wide bike route GIS (Geographic Information System) layer in support of the map development. A stated vision of the C/CAG Bicycle Committee is to make the newly developed bike route information available to the public through an easy-to-use internet website that will assist users in planning bicycle trips within San Mateo County.

In order to facilitate this goal, C/CAG will need to consider the ongoing maintenance requirements of this data set. It should be C/CAG's goal to provide for ongoing maintenance and updates of the map in the future with minimal data maintenance costs.

San Mateo County would like to incorporate the bike route data into an updated County-wide data model which will take advantage of GIS methods to relate the bike routes to County street centerlines, and other GIS features, and minimize the cost of redeveloping the bike route data. In addition, the County would like to develop workflows and applications to support the ongoing maintenance of the bike route data.

### **SCOPE OF WORK**

To support C/CAG's desire to create a bike trip planning website, and develop an accurate and easily maintainable street centerline and bike path GIS feature dataset, The County recommends the following project plan:

Task 1: Develop Linear Reference System (LRS) Data Model to Support County-wide Systems

Task 2: Integrate Bike Path Data into County-wide LRS

Task 3: Develop Path Data Maintenance Workflow and Application

Task 4: Develop Internet Bike Trip Planning Web Site

### **EXPECTED COSTS**

Task List	
Task 1: Develop Linear Reference System (LRS) Data Model to Support County-wide Systems	\$15,000
Task 2: Integrate Bike Path Data into County-wide LRS	\$5,000
Task3: Develop Bike Path Data Maintenance Workflow and Application	\$20,000
Task 4: Develop Internet Bike Trip Planning Web Site	\$25,000
Project Total	\$65,000

The County currently does not have the capability to serve GIS applications over the internet. The above estimate does not reflect the ongoing costs associated with hosting of the web application that is to be developed.



# **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

---

**Date:** December 1, 2005  
**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)  
**From:** Geoffrey Kline, P.E.  
**Subject:** Approval of Countywide Bicycle Plan Project # 4: North-South  
Bikeway (Southern Section)

(For further information or questions contact Geoffrey Kline at 363-4100)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) approve the submittal for the revised Countywide Bicycle Plan Project # 4: North-South Bikeway (Southern Section).

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact to C/CAG.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The original Countywide Bicycle Plan Project # 4: North-South Bikeway (Southern Section) needs revision so that it can be included in the next edition of the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan. A suggested revision to said project is presented for BPAC review and approval.

## **ATTACHMENT**

Bicycle Plan Project # 4: North-South Bikeway (Southern Section).

## **PROJECT # 4: NORTH-SOUTH BIKEWAY (SOUTHERN SECTION)**

**Jurisdictions/Agencies Affected:** Atherton, Menlo Park, Redwood City,  
San Mateo County,  
San Mateo County Transportation Authority,  
CALTRANS

**Sponsor:** Atherton

**Required Actions:** Develop Action Plans to Construct Projects as  
Funding Becomes Available.

**Cost:** \$1,020,000

The North-South Bikeway runs between downtown Redwood City and the San Mateo – Santa Clara County Line at Menlo Park. There are two (2) routes which transit this area: El Camino Real and Middlefield Road. Connecting streets between these routes are Main Street in Redwood City and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Semicircular Road in the North Fair Oaks Area in unincorporated Redwood City. There is a high amount of bicycling in the Southern Section of San Mateo County, especially in the Menlo Park – Palo Alto (Santa Clara County) area.

This project consists of making improvements to the identified routes. These improvements may include traffic signal modifications, appropriate signing, and striping of road surfaces, including shared lane markings in the northern project areas, lane reconfiguration, and other actions which promote bicycling. In addition to coordinating work between San Mateo County jurisdictions, it will also require coordination with the City of Palo Alto to effect a smooth transition between counties. The project should also include improvements on the key connecting streets between El Camino Real and Middlefield Road.

El Camino Real, with high volumes of traffic, is the most direct bicycle commuter route in the Southern Section of San Mateo County. However, Menlo Park has stated that El Camino Real should not be designated as a bicycle commuter route because of the high volumes of traffic and insufficient street width to accommodate bicycles. Middlefield Road or Laurel Street would be better alternatives for selection as bicycle commuter routes. Middlefield Road, throughout Menlo Park and Atherton, is relatively direct, but becomes congested in the street maze in downtown Redwood City. The 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Semicircular Road connection helps to bypass this congestion by routing bicyclists onto Selby Lane in Atherton and Hudson Street in Redwood City. This alternate route, though not nearly as direct a route as El Camino Real, also makes it easier to move across the heavily traveled intersections at Woodside Road (State Route 84).

The project could benefit area residents and carries a relatively low cost; however, it is unclear if bicyclists would use this corridor. Taking into account specific comments from both Atherton and Redwood City, it appears that El Camino Real may not be the proper bicycle commuter route for this particular project. The project needs much additional study to assess its viability and could possibly tend to be rather controversial.

#### **Comments previously received from local jurisdictions regarding Project # 4:**

##### **Town of Atherton**

For project #4, note that Middlefield Road through Atherton has been reconstructed with bicycle lanes re-striped in both directions. Also note that Selby Lane, because it is a high traffic street, needs bicycle lanes from Oakwood Boulevard to El Camino Real to connect the Hudson-Selby Bypass Route in Redwood City to the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Semi-Circular Road/Middlefield Road segments of the project. The El Camino Real crosswalk at Selby Lane needs an in-street lighted crosswalk to enable bicyclists, as well as pedestrians, to cross safely. An alternative is to provide a dedicated path on the west side of El Camino Real to the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue signal. However, there may not be adequate right of way to provide such a path without significant underground drainage improvements at a far higher cost than the crosswalk. We estimate it will cost about \$50,000 for the crosswalk. Two-way bicycle traffic on the shoulder of southbound El Camino Real is not a viable solution. Note that this crossing is also a school crossing for access to the Selby Lane School from part of its attendance area east of El Camino Real, so an in-street lighted crosswalk would have a double benefit.

##### **City of Redwood City**

There is mention of "...implementing improvements on Main Street and El Camino Real in Redwood City and Atherton..." Does this mean that there will be a direct connection for bicyclists at Main Street and El Camino Real? Currently access on and off of Main Street is only from the northbound lanes of El Camino Real. Furthermore, this intersection is located at the El Camino Real/Woodside Road Interchange, which has on- and off-ramps. How will this existing complicated street/arterial/interchange configuration be adapted to safely accommodate bicyclists?

Another concern is how to make the segment of El Camino Real between Main Street and Menlo Park a more bicycle-friendly street environment. Signage and pavement striping would help. Perhaps narrowing the travel lanes on El Camino Real would allow more room for bicycle lanes. The addition of traffic-calming treatment such as landscaped islands along El Camino Real to slow automobile traffic while enhancing the safety of bicyclists might also be appropriate, although this would require approval from CALTRANS.

An alternate route might be to use Shasta Street between Main and Charter Streets. Shasta Street passes beneath the Woodside Road overpass. The Bike Route could proceed to El Camino Real via Charter Street. Another option might be to provide an access

easement across the Target/Mid-Peninsula Plaza parking lot. The bike route would continue on Westmoreland and Glendale Avenues to the Fifth Avenue underpass. Because there is a parallel street grade separation, bicycles would not have to cross Fifth Avenue at grade.

If Middlefield Road is used as a bike route, some street modification may be necessary such as narrowing travel lanes to allow for bike lanes. Traffic calming might also be appropriate. The Middlefield/Woodside Road intersection will require some modification to allow for the safe and convenient movement of bicycles.

**Findings:**

Atherton and Menlo Park do not advocate use of El Camino Real as a bicycle route.

San Mateo County does not advocate use of Middlefield Road as a bicycle route. There is a major conflict. How should this discrepancy be rectified?

*Previous Comment from San Mateo County:*

*The San Mateo County Corridor Plans that was done for Middlefield Road in the County area does not provide for bike lanes because right-of-way is limited. If this project is to go forward, an alternate route would need to be identified if a separate lane is desired.*

# BICYCLE PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SHEET

**Project #4:** North – South Bikeway (Southern Section)

**Sponsor:** Atherton

**Estimate Year:** 2005

**Preliminary Engineering:** \$100,000

Environmental:  
Right-of-Way:  
Permits:  
Design:



\$100,000

**Construction:** \$675,000

Pathway work:  
Curbs/gutters:  
Pavement repair:  
Shoulder work: \$50,000  
Bridge/overcrossing work:  
Turn lanes: \$200,000  
Traffic signal modifications: \$150,000  
Pavement striping: \$100,000  
Loop detectors:  
Signage: \$100,000  
Construction inspection: \$75,000  
(@ 12.5% of construction)

**Miscellaneous:** \$30,000

Bicycle parking:  
Bicycle lockers:  
Bicycle racks:  
Maintenance provisions: \$2000/mile X 15 miles/yr = \$30,000

**Subtotals:** \$805,000

Overhead @ 15%: \$120,750  
Contingency @ 10%: \$92,575

**Total:** \$1,018,325

**Total Estimate (nearest high \$10,000):** \$1,020,000

Note: Costs in current year dollars. Estimate made April 21, 2005.

MP	2.4/9.8 = 24.5%	249,900 = 250,000
Ath	3.1/9.8 = 31.6%	322,320 = 322,000
Co	.9/9.8 = 9.2%	93,840 = 94,000
RC	3.4/9.8 = 34.7%	353,940 = 354,000



Proportional cost for  
9.8 miles of proposed  
project length.

**Project #4:****North-South Bikeway (Southern Section)****City(ies):** Menlo Park, Atherton, Redwood City**Primary Responsibility:** Public Works of Cities Listed Above**Right-of-Way Control:** Cities, Caltrans**Required Studies/Actions:** Preliminary Design, Design**Cost:** \$220,000

The North-South Bikeway from downtown Redwood City through Atherton and Menlo Park and into Palo Alto is proposed to utilize two routes, Middlefield and El Camino Real. This section of the North-South Bikeway is anticipated to experience high use considering the high level of bicycling in the area, especially Menlo Park. It will also require close coordination with the City of Palo Alto, which is currently re-doing its Bicycle Master Plan.

This project consists of implementing improvements on Main Street and El Camino Real in Redwood City and Atherton, including signal improvements, signing, striping, lane re-striping, and other items as feasible. Preliminary analysis indicates that El Camino Real, while carrying higher traffic volumes, offers relatively few side streets and is a good direct bicycle commuter route into Menlo Park. The project also includes improvements to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Middlefield Road, and Semicircular Road to provide a connection between existing bike lanes on Middlefield in Menlo Park and Redwood City. This connection will also serve bicyclists headed for the Hudson-Selby Bypass Route of downtown Redwood City.

San Mateo County  
Transportation Authority

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** December 1, 2005

**To:** Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)  
MEMBERSHIP POLICY

(For further information or questions, contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

This report is for BPAC member information. It outlines the staff recommendation to the C/CAG Board regarding future BPAC membership policy and reappointment of public members.

### **Proposed Policy:**

That the C/CAG Board consider the adoption of the following policies to be used for appointment and reappointment of BPAC public members:

- For reappointment of existing members, past attendance records should be a consideration. The attendance policy should be in accordance with the adopted Board Policy which is that members are required to attend a minimum of 75% of all meetings (including regular meetings that did not achieve a quorum) in the past consecutive 12 months.
- No more than two (2) members, either elected or public, should reside in the same jurisdiction. This new requirement will only apply to new applicants to BPAC and not to existing members.
- Candidates will complete the BPAC Membership Application Form.
- Recruitment announcements should be sent to local Bicycle and Pedestrian groups.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact to C/CAG.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

At the April 14, 2005 C/CAG Board meeting, the Board discussed the issue of public (non-elected) members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). This discussion cited the need for a policy to guide the appointment of BPAC public members, for which C/CAG is ultimately responsible. The Board directed staff to recommend a policy to be used for appointment of BPAC public members. The policy should address the candidates' place of residence versus place of employment, geographical diversity, and increased interest on the part of local jurisdictions as some of the criteria which may be considered in a future applicant evaluation process.

Current BPAC public membership policy states that the maximum number of terms is defined as three two-year terms, excluding the time to fulfill an out-going member's term. C/CAG Bylaws (under Article VI – Committees) also states that "During any consecutive twelve month period, members will be expected to attend at least 75% of the scheduled meetings and not have more than three consecutive absences. If the number of absences exceeds these limits, the seat may be declared vacant by the C/CAG Chair".

At the July 28, 2005 BPAC meeting, Members Lempert, Matsumoto, and Barnes volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to develop criteria and qualifications for BPAC public membership. This subcommittee met on August 31, 2005 to develop recommendations on membership criteria. Those recommendations are documented in the Minutes of the August 31, 2005 meeting (attached).

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Minutes of August 31, 2005 Subcommittee meeting.



## Membership Criteria Subcommittee Meeting Minutes:

Date: August 31, 2005 @5:30 P.M.  
Location: San Mateo City Hall, Room A  
Subcommittee Members: Karyl Matsumoto, Sue Lempert, Michael Barnes  
Staff support: Walter Martone, Sandy Wong

The BPAC Subcommittee met and discussed proposed criteria for public membership appointment and reappointment for the BPAC. Below is summary of decisions made at this subcommittee meeting.

- For reappointment of existing members, past attendance records should be a consideration. The attendance policy should be that members are required to attend a minimum of 75% of all meetings (including regular meetings that did not achieve a quorum) in the past consecutive 12 months.
- Prior to making an appointment or re-appointment of a public member, the C/CAG Chair will appoint an Evaluation Subcommittee from the C/CAG Board. The Evaluation Subcommittee shall interview all candidates based on the same criteria, and make appointment recommendations to the C/CAG Board.
- No public member should be a current public employee of a jurisdiction in San Mateo County. This new requirement will only apply to new applicants to BPAC and not existing members.
- No more than two (2) members, either elected or public, should reside in the same jurisdiction.

The Subcommittee has also made the following suggestions:

- Current member, either elected and public, who has not attended at least 60% of the regular meetings over the past 12 consecutive months should not be permitted to vote on the allocation of funds. For this purpose, attendance in a meeting that did not achieve a quorum is included.
- Candidates will complete the BPAC Membership Application Form.
- Recruitment announcements be sent to local Bicycle and Pedestrian groups.



**C/CAG**  
**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**  
**OF SAN MATEO COUNTY**

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

**Date:** December 1, 2005  
**To:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)  
**From:** Geoffrey C. Kline, P.E.  
**Subject:** Update to Countywide Pedestrian Plan

(For further information, contact Geoff Kline at 363-4100.)

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) consider additions/new language to the Countywide Pedestrian Plan which incorporate suggestions from the July 2005 BPAC meeting.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact to C/CAG.

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

At the July 2005 meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), a suggestion was made to add a section on Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. In addition, it was suggested that new language be added to provide aesthetic improvements in order to encourage people to walk and new language to provide connectivity between home, transit, and jobs. In order to provide continuity in how the new material will assimilate into the basic document, the approved Countywide Pedestrian Plan has been provided for your use and information.

An additional section on TOD consists of the program rules and guidelines and the results of the third cycle, approved in May 2005. Because the TOD program is fluid, updates to the applicable attachment will automatically be made upon either changes in program or new funding being made. The new material will be added as the following:

Update to Countywide Pedestrian Plan

C. **Pedestrian Policies.**

11. **Transit Oriented Development (TOD)**

To provide an improved connection between land use and transportation, the latest information on TOD as it is practiced in San Mateo County is included as an approved policy. TOD is a very important element to encourage walking. Attachments A and B outline the program in its current form:

Attachment A - Initiative for Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program

Attachment B - Results of the Third Cycle of the San Mateo County TOD Housing Incentive Program

A new section under C. **Pedestrian Policies** has been added to provide aesthetic improvements in order to encourage people to walk. It is recommended that this #3. section be inserted directly after 2. **Land Use and Urban Design** with all the following sections being renumbered accordingly. The new language is as follows:

3. (new) **Aesthetic Improvements**

Encourage cities to develop open space in those areas which would promote walking via scenic pathways, such as found in Central Park in San Mateo. Landscape with ponds, vegetation, and lighting which will provide an incentive for people to walk. With San Francisco Bay so close to so many San Mateo County neighborhoods, make use of this natural resource to provide a backdrop for walking activities as much as possible. Promote any interesting features that the public will wish to view.

A revision to C. **Pedestrian Policies** 8. **Job Location** will now read 8. **Job Location/Connectivity** and have added language as follows: . . . multi-family housing. "Provide for better connectivity between home, transit, and jobs by planning for either new or rehabilitated walking surfaces which more directly link destinations to which pedestrians need or will travel." This should emphasize connectivity as an important issue to promote walking.

**ATTACHMENT**

Approved Countywide Transportation Plan with new Attachments A & B.

**A. BACKGROUND****1. Changes in Pedestrian Travel over the Years**

Before the advent of trains, streetcars, and automobiles, walking was the main transportation mode for most commuters. Cities were smaller and much more compact, and housing was closely interspersed with industrial and commercial areas. Private horse-drawn carriages were not affordable for most, and so it was only the relatively wealthy who could afford to live outside the dense urban core and avoid walking, which is limited in its range.

Toward the end of the Nineteenth Century, the compact "walking city" was transformed by new technologies that allowed housing to be located farther away from industry and commerce. Streetcars, for example, connected a city's central business district with new neighborhoods on formerly agricultural land. Walking was still an important part of these neighborhoods because walking provided the link between one's home and the streetcar line. Likewise, patrons of other transportation modes, such as trains, trolleys, and cable cars, relied primarily on walking to reach the actual transit vehicles.

The importance of walking during this past period was reflected in urban design. Wide sidewalks were common, and stores took advantage of pedestrian traffic with ground-level window displays. Grand city parks were designed with pedestrians in mind. Walking was an important part not only of transportation but also of social life and recreation.

The importance of walking diminished as automobiles became more widespread. Automobiles provided a single, high-speed transportation mode from home to workplace and allowed commuters to live much farther from the central city than was ever possible before. As automobiles became affordable to a large segment of society, people increasingly chose to live in lower density suburbs designed for the automobile.

Automobiles had significant impacts on urban design. Stores were moved back from the street to make space for parking. Entire neighborhoods were demolished to make room for freeways, which were often built without provision for pedestrians. Sidewalks were narrowed to increase roadway capacity. Homes and businesses were oriented around the garage and the parking lot rather than the street entry. By accommodating the car drivers' desire for higher

speeds and more space, these changes diminished the safety, ease, and pleasure of walking.

Development in San Mateo County over the past fifty (50) years has been especially auto-oriented. While small remnants of compact, pedestrian-friendly developments may still be found, mainly around Caltrain stations, the vast majority of San Mateo County's developed land is characterized by wide, high-speed arterial roadways, single-use districts accessible only by car, and urban design that focuses on accommodating the needs of car drivers. The needs of the walking community have been relegated to the background.

### 2. Profile of Pedestrians

According to the 2000 Census, 7,609 San Mateo County workers 16 years and older walked to work. In a 2003 survey by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters, three percent of County residents walked as their primary commute mode, which was more than either Caltrain riders (1.0 percent) or bicyclists (1.0 percent). The walking rate for the San Francisco Bay Area was 3.0 percent. These statistics do not include walking as a connecting mode, meaning at the beginning or end of a transit trip. Walking composed 1.0 percent of connecting modes in the Bay Area according to the 2003 RIDES study. Many residents also walk for recreation or for short errands, although no data on this type of walking has been collected to date.

While most San Mateo County residents rely on the automobile for their daily transportation needs, some residents have no other option but to walk. Children often walk to and from school or to and from a bus stop. Elderly residents with impaired vision or other ailments may not be able to drive but still desire to independently fulfill their shopping or recreational needs by walking. Persons with disabilities represent another group for whom walking, or walking combined with transit, may be the only mobility option.

According to a 2002 study by the Surface Transportation Policy Project, San Mateo County had the sixth highest "Pedestrian Danger Index" among California counties with greater than 100,000 population. This index compares the number of pedestrian incidents, including fatalities and injuries, against the level of pedestrian activity. The Surface Transportation Policy Project is a national coalition of more than 200 organizations working to promote

transportation policies that protect neighborhoods, provide better travel choices, and promote social equity.

3. **Existing Conditions**

a. **Description of Pedestrian Network—Existing Conditions**

The physical spaces and devices used to complete walking trips can be thought of as a "pedestrian network," much like the network of signs, roads, and freeways used by automobiles. This section describes the elements of this network and explains how land use decisions and practices affect the quality of the network.

The most important and prevalent element of the pedestrian network is sidewalks. In general, the volume of pedestrian traffic determines sidewalk width. Hence, downtown shopping areas generally have wider sidewalks than single-family residential areas, and many industrial and office park areas do not have sidewalks at all. In urbanized areas, sidewalks are common and represent the bulk of the pedestrian network. Many residential streets have curb-and-gutter designs without sidewalks. On such streets, the roadway shoulder necessarily becomes a space for walking, although it is also used for automobile parking.

Dedicated pedestrian walkways form another part of the pedestrian network, although they are not widespread. These include freeway overpasses, railroad underpasses, and off-street paths. In some areas of San Mateo County, particularly North Fair Oaks and the City of San Bruno, undeveloped portions of the Caltrain right-of-way function as informal, albeit illegal, pedestrian routes.

Most walking trips involve crossing a vehicular roadway. Therefore, crossing signals, marked crosswalks, and signs alerting automobiles of pedestrians are an important part of the pedestrian network. For school children, human crossing guards give added protection against car traffic. At high volume roadway crossings, audible signals for the visually impaired also make up part of the pedestrian network. Another provision for persons with disabilities is the curb cut, a portion of the sidewalk that slopes to the level of the roadway to enable wheelchairs and similar devices to make the crossing of the street much easier.

Land use has a tremendous influence on the quality of the pedestrian network. Many areas have no nearby destinations for pedestrians, such as parks or local markets, but instead are zoned so as to encourage the use of an automobile for every trip. Such areas not only contribute to regional congestion and air pollution but also isolate those residents who cannot drive. Although much of San Mateo County fits this description, there are several examples of pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods and spaces to be found.

**b. Neighborhoods**

In general, San Mateo County's oldest residential neighborhoods are well suited for walking. Such neighborhoods are generally located close to El Camino Real and the Caltrain railroad line, where commercial activities, public buildings, and parks are concentrated. Although El Camino Real can present a noisy, dangerous barrier to pedestrian movement, it also serves as a destination for those living on nearby residential streets. The residential areas that surround the downtowns of Burlingame, San Mateo, San Carlos, and Menlo Park offer low volume traffic and tree-lined streets that invite walking.

**c. Shopping Districts and Malls**

It is no surprise that commercial areas that were developed before the automobile became widespread are better suited to walking. Such areas have buildings that are located at street level to invite the pedestrian to look in display windows and also provide the pedestrian with a sense of shelter and protection. These areas offer trees for beauty and shade, as well as other amenities such as benches, pay phones, and lighting. Streets are usually narrow and encourage cars to slow down.

In contrast, commercial areas oriented to the automobile are not ideal for walking. Shopping malls, for example, are generally surrounded by large expanses of parking lot which the pedestrian must cross in order to reach the mall itself while stepping in oil patches and avoiding moving cars. It is rare to find a shopping mall with a direct entrance from a public street.



**d. Schools**

Because schools in San Mateo County are generally located in lower density residential areas, traffic concerns are somewhat mitigated. Crosswalks, crossing guards, warning signs, and speed limits tend to mitigate traffic impacts. Although most schools have adequate sidewalks to allow pedestrian access, some do not. For these schools, the State of California Safe Routes to School Program may help to alleviate the problem.

**e. Bus Stops**

Bus stops are generally accessible from sidewalks. However, pedestrian amenities such as lighting, benches, and shelters are often inadequate.

**f. Caltrain Stations and Rights-of-way**

Caltrain is currently improving pedestrian access and safety at many of its stations within San Mateo County. Improvements include warning devices, revamped crossing surfaces, and new boarding platforms. The Belmont-San Carlos Grade Separation Project incorporated dedicated pedestrian/bicycle underpasses, ramps and elevators to the station platforms, and benches and shelters for passengers.

Despite these improvements, the Caltrain tracks often hinder pedestrian travel in other locations. Many portions of the right-of-way are not fenced and encourage pedestrians to cross the tracks in an unsafe manner. Some portions are fenced but do not have pedestrian tunnels or overpasses to aid in crossing. This makes trips to destinations on the other side of the tracks much longer and discourages walking.

**g. BART Stations**

Nevin Way, a dedicated walkway between El Camino Real and Colma BART Station, has improved pedestrian access to and from this station. The BART-San Francisco International Airport (SFO) extension includes a bike path that may also serve as a pedestrian way once it is constructed.

BART has station design standards that require full accessibility for persons with disabilities. Since all BART tracks are grade separated, the tracks do not usually act as barriers to pedestrian movement.

### ***h. Commercial/Industrial Areas***

Most large corporations in San Mateo County are located near the Bayshore Freeway (US 101) in facilities with poor pedestrian access. They are typically set back from the street, surrounded by parking, and located far from residential areas. Consequently, they attract large numbers of private auto trips and discourage pedestrians.

### ***i. Improvement Plans and Programs***

There are several established transportation funding programs that can help to develop pedestrian improvements in San Mateo County. These include the ½ cent sales tax approved by voters (Measure A), the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article #3 funding program, the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA), Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP), Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) funds, and Transportation for Liveable Communities (TLC) funding. In addition, the State legislature has passed a bill (Safe Routes to School) to construct projects to improve pedestrian access to schools. C/CAG's Transportation Oriented Development (TOD) program encourages multi-use, high density development located close to transit, which, in turn, encourages planners and designers to account for the pedestrian within the specific development project. All these programs are available for pedestrian initiatives. However, considering all these various funding sources, there has been no attempt to create a comprehensive program to improve San Mateo County's pedestrian network.

## ***B. ISSUES***

### ***1. Strategy for Improving Pedestrian Facilities***

As previously discussed, there are many opportunities to improve San Mateo County's pedestrian network and encourage walking. These

opportunities can be put into four general categories: land use and urban design, parking lot design and placement, traffic calming, and pedestrian safety.

**a. Land Use and Urban Design**

Land use decisions such as zoning and development review have tremendous influence on the quality of the pedestrian network. By providing pedestrian destinations within, or near, residential areas, such as parks, small markets, and retail and office space, planners can encourage more walking and discourage the use of an automobile for every trip. Multi-use districts, where housing is interspersed with businesses, encourage walking by creating more potential short distance commutes. Zoning and development decisions also present opportunities to require urban design practices that foster walking, such as pedestrian amenities, landscaping, appropriate building scale, and architectural interests.

**b. Parking Lot Design and Placement**

Pedestrians generally feel uncomfortable walking on streets, where buildings are set far back from the street with parking lots in between. This means that on one side cars pass quickly by in the roadway, while on the other side, there is nothing to see but parked cars. This creates a desolate, uninteresting streetscape where one feels exposed to crime and/or security issues. Instead, parking lots should be placed behind buildings and away from the street. This makes it possible to locate buildings next to the street, a practice that encourages walking by making buildings more accessible and providing a sense of shelter and architectural interest.

**c. Traffic Calming**

Drivers tend to travel faster when they are on a wide, unobstructed roadway. To discourage high auto speeds that make walking less safe, planners have devised several ways to remove the perception of a high speed road, and thereby "calm" traffic. These include narrowing the roadway by widening sidewalks or creating parking areas along the sides

of the road, adding "rough" pavement which encourages lower speeds, adding bumps, curves, or islands, and other methods which help to slow traffic speed.

**d. Pedestrian Safety**

Research indicates that pedestrian safety is a serious problem in San Mateo County. Crosswalks, crossing signals, dedicated walkways, new sidewalks, and other such improvements are essential to make the pedestrian network safer. Cities need to identify places where such improvements are necessary to reduce clear dangers to pedestrians. This will not only benefit those who currently walk, but will encourage additional walking trips leading to reduced congestion and air quality benefits. The following are of particular concern for pedestrian safety:

- (1) Caltrain right-of-way grade separations (i.e., tunnels, overpasses, etc.) for dedicated pedestrian and bicycle use.
- (2) Freeway overpasses for dedicated pedestrian use and overpass sidewalks separated from auto traffic by railings or landscaping.
- (3) Improved freeway on/off ramp design including safer pedestrian crossings.
- (4) Center "safe zones" on wide, high volume roadway crossings.
- (5) Incomplete or missing sidewalks, and gaps in the sidewalk network, especially near schools.

**2. Possible Project Types to Achieve Improvement in Pedestrian Facilities**

General project types that encourage walking or related activities usually emphasize safety and/or the segregation of pedestrians from motor vehicles. Examples of relevant project types follow:

- a. Sidewalk construction including wheelchair ramps.
- b. Roadway shoulder work in the absence of sidewalks.

- c. Overpasses across high speed roadways.
- d. Underpasses beneath railroad tracks.
- e. Paths off the street.
- f. Crossing signals at intersections.
  - 1) Audible for the visually impaired.
  - 2) Countdown.
  - 3) Push button.
- g. Crosswalks
  - 1) Mid-block and intersections.
  - 2) Flashing lights.
- h. Warning signs installation.
- i. Landscaping.
- j. Amenities such as benches and proper drainage.
- k. Safety lighting.
- l. Bus stops and shelters.
- m. Railroad crossing gates and warning devices.
- n. Walking surfaces.
- o. Roadway medians and center zones.

**C. PEDESTRIAN POLICIES**

**1. Market Share**

Increase the percentage of people walking to work by implementing strategies and techniques described herein. Promote the benefits of walking.

### **2. Land Use and Urban Design**

Encourage cities to promote land use patterns and developments that make walking a viable and inviting mode of transportation. Allow appropriate mixed uses. Locate walkable destinations such as parks and markets within and near residential areas. Design residential and commercial districts with human-scaled, interesting buildings, low traffic speeds, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities such as benches.

### **3. Parking Lots**

Encourage cities to locate parking lots behind businesses rather than on the street. Design parking lots with safe, attractive, and clearly marked pedestrian routes.

### **4. Safety**

Encourage cities to identify locations where pedestrian movement is dangerous, and make appropriate safety improvements. Focus on the following areas: wide, high-speed roadway crossings; freeway on/off ramps; unsafe/inadequate railroad crossings; and areas of missing sidewalks.

### **5. Traffic Calming**

In areas with high levels of pedestrian traffic, encourage cities to use narrow streets, rough pavement, speed bumps, islands, and other similar methods to slow automobiles. Keep the needs of the pedestrian in mind.

### **6. Priorities**

Because funding will never cover all projects that might be accomplished, evaluate projects based on need. Prioritize funding for pedestrian improvements as follows:

- a. Safety measures.
- b. Mobility needs of walking-dependent populations such as school children, the elderly, people with disabilities, etc.
- c. Promote walking as a viable commute mode: land use decisions, better urban design, close "gaps" in pedestrian network, etc.
- d. Increase the number of walkers who will benefit by the improvements.
- e. Develop recreational pathways.

**7. Increase the Number of Funded Pedestrian Projects**

Establish policies which stipulate actual percentages of specific funding to be allocated to pedestrian projects. Make sure that pedestrian projects are competitive with projects emphasizing other modes of transportation.

**8. Job Location**

Encourage cities to place jobs in locations that make walking attractive. Evaluate and update land use designations to promote job growth within walking distance of transit stations and multi-family housing.

**9. Traffic Mitigation**

Encourage cities to implement pedestrian-oriented traffic mitigations. This relates to funding of pedestrian projects.

**10. Education**

Promote improved education in the pedestrian field. Make use of the resources of the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance to further this aim.

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park •  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County •  
South San Francisco • Woodside*

### INITIATIVE FOR TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM

#### **GOAL**

Promote, support, and facilitate Transit Oriented Development projects throughout the County in order to provide a better relationship between land use and transportation.

#### **OBJECTIVE**

- (1) Provide financial incentives to jurisdictions that build Transit Oriented Development by rewarding them with additional funds for transportation projects.
- (2) Encourage jurisdictions that receive additional transportation funding to find some way of financially assisting TOD projects so that they become economically viable.

#### **PROGRAM COMPONENTS**

#### **DEFINITION**

Define Transit Oriented Development (TOD) as permanent high density residential housing with a minimum density of 40 units per net acre, preferably mixed with other uses, located one-third of a mile or less from access to CalTrain or BART stations.

#### **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TOD PROJECTS**

Establish the following eligibility requirements.

- (1) The TOD project meets the stated definition.
- (2) The City Council of the jurisdiction has sent a letter approving the TOD project for submittal to C/CAG for evaluation.
- (3) The project receives all formal approvals by the jurisdiction after authorization of the funding cycle.

Attachment A



## **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS**

- (1) The transportation project(s) meet the requirements of the relevant federal or State transportation program.
- (2) The transportation projects do not necessarily have to relate to the TOD project.

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **(1) Reservation of Funds**

During each discretionary federal and State programming cycle, consider establishing a reserve of transportation funds to be distributed as incentives/bonuses to jurisdictions that build TOD housing. Consider reserving 10 percent of the total amount of funding in each cycle.

#### **(2) Call for Projects**

During each programming cycle, notify jurisdictions of the availability of reserved funds. Distribute applications to all jurisdictions and request that all applications are submitted within two months to C/CAG to determine eligibility.

#### **(3) Evaluation of TOD Projects**

Evaluate eligibility of TOD projects based on their conformance with the definition of TOD housing. Evaluation will not involve scoring or ranking. Allocate up to \$2,000 per bedroom for TOD projects for eligible transportation projects. An additional incentive of up to \$250 per bedroom will be provided for those projects that provide a minimum of 10 per cent low to moderate income housing. If there is not enough money to fund all eligible projects, then the amount allocated per bedroom will be reduced or more funding will be sought.

#### **(4) Evaluation of Transportation Projects**

Once a TOD project has been approved, request the jurisdiction to submit application for transportation projects. Evaluate the eligibility of transportation projects based on their conformance with the requirements of the relevant federal or State transportation program. Evaluation will not involve scoring or ranking.

#### **(5) Timing**

The TOD project must be completed or under construction within two years after the beginning of the programming cycle. If the project is not under construction within two years, the jurisdiction will have to reapply for funding.

**(6) Definition of Completion/ Under Construction**

The City/ County is considered eligible for the incentive if the project is determined to be under construction in accordance with the following requirements. There are physical units visibly completed or partially completed (under construction). As a minimum the project must have received building permits, demonstrate that less visible construction has started (such as fencing, grading, utilities, infrastructure etc.) and that both the developer and the City/ County are clearly obligated for completion of the project in a timely manner. The City/ County must submit the appropriate supporting documentation. However, the incentive will not be programmed until the construction is completed.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

---

**Date:** May 12, 2005

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** Congestion Management Program and Air Quality Committee

**Subject:** REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE THIRD CYCLE OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS OF COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES TO FOURTEEN PROJECT SPONSORS FOR A TOTAL OF \$2,700,000. RESOLUTION 05-13 - CITY OF REDWOOD CITY (WALNUT STREET CONDOMINIUMS) - \$35,460, RESOLUTION 05-14 - CITY OF MENLO PARK (O'BRIEN AT DERRY LANE) - \$278,222, RESOLUTION 05-15 - CITY OF SAN CARLOS (1000 EL CAMINO REAL) - \$181,886, RESOLUTION 05-16 - CITY OF BURLINGAME (CALIFORNIA MURCHISON) - \$45,360, RESOLUTION 05-17 - CITY OF SAN BRUNO (PARAGON APARTMENTS) - \$383,132, RESOLUTION 05-18 - CITY OF SAN BRUNO (VILLAGE AT THE CROSSING) - \$396,340, RESOLUTION 05-19 - CITY OF SAN BRUNO (SAN BRUNO PLAZA) - \$61,466, RESOLUTION 05-20 - CITY OF MILLBRAE (BELAMOR) - \$320,332, RESOLUTION 05-21 - CITY OF REDWOOD CITY (MONTGOMERY VILLAS) - \$163,590, RESOLUTION 05-22 - CITY OF SAN MATEO (PALM RESIDENCES) - \$37,086, RESOLUTION 05-23 - CITY OF SAN MATEO (DELAWARE PLACE) - \$335,104, RESOLUTION 05-24 CITY OF SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO (SSF BART STATION TRANSIT VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT) - \$177,012, RESOLUTION 05-25 - CITY OF DALY CITY (LANDMARK PLAZA) - \$229,020, RESOLUTION 05-26 - CITY OF DALY CITY (AMERICAN BAPTIST HOMES OF THE WEST) - \$54,530.

(For further information please contact Tom Madalena at 650-363-1867)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Board consider the approval of the following projects (presented in attached summary) for the 2005 Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program Initiative that have been reviewed and approved by staff, the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Congestion Management Program and Air Quality Committee (CMAQ).

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

This initiative will help cities that are approving TOD projects receive money earmarked for transportation projects. The cities with qualified projects that build TOD housing within 2 years will receive the financial incentive once the project is built.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

There is \$2,700,000 available for this cycle of the program. The funding sources include the State Transportation Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Program, and Transportation for Livable Communities. All unused funds will be returned to the program for use in a later cycle.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The objective of this program is to encourage high-density housing (greater than 40 units per acre) within 1/3 of a mile of a BART or Caltrain station. For eligible housing projects, C/CAG will make a commitment to program the incentive funds to a transportation project identified by the sponsor if the housing is built within two years.

There were a total of 14 projects that were approved for this cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program Initiative. These projects collectively include 2,192 bedrooms of which 727 will be affordable to low and moderate-income households. Based on the number of bedrooms approved there will be \$1,182 available for each bedroom built and an additional \$148 available for each affordable bedroom built.

In order to determine the dollar amount for each bedroom we multiplied the number of bedrooms and affordable bedrooms times \$2,000 and \$250, respectively. From this we determined the percentage share that each category (regular bedrooms and affordable bedrooms) would have with an unlimited amount of money. It was calculated that of the \$2,700,000, 96% of it would be available for regular bedrooms and 4% would be available for affordable bedrooms. Given this breakdown we have \$1,182 available for each regular bedroom and \$148 available for each affordable bedroom.

Example:       $2,192 \text{ bedrooms} \times \$2,000 = \$4,384,000 = 96\% \text{ of } \$4,565,750$   
                  $727 \text{ affordable bedrooms} \times \$250 = \$181,750 = 4\% \text{ of } \$4,565,750$

$\$2,700,000 \times 96\% = \$2,592,000$   
 $\$2,700,000 \times 4\% = \$108,000$

$\$2,592,000 / 2,192 = \$1,182.48$   
 $\$108,000 / 727 = \$148.56$

For this third cycle of the TOD program C/CAG will recognize the current level of stations that were operating during the call for projects. The proposed suspension of service to some Caltrain stations will not affect projects in this cycle. Projects that may be near these stations will still receive the incentive as long as they meet all of the conditions required in their respective resolution.

It is apparent from the number of approved projects for this cycle of the TOD program that cities have taken notice and are approving projects that provide needed housing near transit.

#### ATTACHMENT

Summary of the approved applications  
14 Resolutions (Resolution 05-13 – Resolution 05-26)